DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 237 557 TM 830 821

TITLE	Summer School Pilot 1983: Second Report to the Texas Education Agency.
INSTITUTION	Austin Independent School District, Tex. Office of Research and Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	Texas Education Agency, Austin.
REPORT NO	AISD-ORE-83.04
PUB DATE	Nov 83
NOTE	52p.; Many pages are marginally legible due to small or faint print. For related documents, see TM 830 770-772 and TM 830 867.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Statistical Data (110)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Basic Skills; Check Lists; Classroom Observation Techniques; Elementary Education; Followup Studies; Grade Repetition; Pilot Projects; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; *Remedial Programs; School Districts; *Student Evaluation; *Summer Programs; *Summer Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*Austin Independent School District TX

ABSTRACT

The Austin (TX) Independent School District presents its second report to the Texas Education Agency concerning the Summer School Pilot 1983. It contains a final report summary, a teacher checklist, and an observation followup. The report summary includes the following major findings: (1) retainees who attended summer school and those who did not were rated about the same in reading and math skills and behavior by the fall teachers utilizing a checklist. (2) Project staff had a very favorable view of the summer school program, especially: mastery and supplemental materials, preplanning and inservice programs, smaller campus and class size, support services, and reinforcers used. A change in the eligibility requirement has been approved for next year to allow the program to serve some low achievers who will not be retained. (3) Additional analyses on first-grade observations reveal that, compared to overall instructional time, less time was spent on both instruction in the library and on the first day of class, and there seemed to be little difference in instructional time based on staggered or unstaggered schedules. An instrument description, and details of the purpose, procedures, and results of the teacher checklist and observation followup are included. (PN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED237557

SUMMER SCHOOL PILOT 1983:

Second Report to the Texas Education Agency

November 1983

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. Holley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TM 830 821

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
DISTRICT NO. 227-901
6100 GUADALUPE, BOX 79
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78752
(512) 458-1228

Evaluation Contact Person:
Nancy Schuyler
District Priorities

SUMMER SCHOOL PILOT 1983:

Second Report to the Texas Education Agency

November 1983

SUBMITTED TO:

Office of Planning
and Research
Texas Education Agency

Approved:

Glynn Ligon, Ph.D.
Acting Director, Research and Evaluation

John Ellis, Superintendent

Publication No. 83.04

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
Office of Planning and Research

Summer School Pilot Projects
Project Evaluation Abstract
Interim Program and Evaluation Report

I. Identification

A. District Name: Austin Independent School District

B. Project Title: Summer School Pilot

C. Project Contact Person:

Name	Title	Address	Telephone
Instruction: Hermelinda Rodriguez	Director of Elementary Management	6100 Guadalupe Austin, TX 78752	451-8411
Evaluation: Nancy Schuyler	Evaluator, District Priorities	6100 Guadalupe Box 79 Austin, TX 78752	458-1227

One copy of this abstract is to be submitted with the Interim Program and Evaluation Report by December 2, 1983 to:

Office of Planning and Research
Texas Education Agency
201 East 11th Street
Austin, Texas 78701

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Final Report Summary 1

Teacher Checklist. A-1

Observation Followup B-1

83.04

FINAL REPORT SUMMARY

Project Title: 1983 Summer School Pilot Project

Contact Person: Nancy Schuyler

Major Findings:

1. Retainees who attended summer school and those who did not were rated about the same in reading and math skills and behavior by the fall teachers.

2. Project staff had a very favorable view of the summer school program, especially:

   - The mastery and supplemental materials in reading, math, and the bilingual programs:
   - The amount of preplanning and the inservice programs;
   - The smaller campus and class sizes;
   - Support services on campus and at the central-office level;
   - The reinforcers used, especially calculators and scented stickers.

   A change in the eligibility requirements has been approved for next year to allow the program to serve some low achievers who will not be retained.

3. Additional analyses on first-grade observations reveal that, compared to overall instructional time:

   - Less time was spent on instruction in the library,
   - Less time was spent on instruction the first day of class,
   - About the same amount of time was spent on instruction in schools which split class periods into two parts for reading and/or math and those that did not.

HOW DID FALL TEACHERS RATE THE SKILLS OF RETAINEES?

TEA granted AISD permission to use a teacher checklist rather than fall testing to measure the reading and math skills of retainees. Ratings on the skills and behavior of 118 randomly selected retainees who had attended summer school and 119 who had not were obtained in October, 1983. Teachers were simply asked to rate the retainee compared to other students in their classes--summer school attendance was not mentioned.

Retainees were most commonly rated average in reading and math skills compared to their classmates. Chi-square comparisons for summer-school attenders and nonattenders revealed no significant differences in reading and math skill ratings. Thus, it appears summer-school retainees' mastery of skills did not have sufficient impact to boost fall skill ratings.

In terms of behavior, little difference was found in the ratings for retainees who attended summer school and those who did not.

- On the average, both groups were ready, willing, and able to participate in class fairly often although not frequently.
- On the average, both groups of retainees were disruptive in class only occasionally.

Appendix A provides complete results from the Retainee Checklist filled in by teachers.

WAS LESS TIME SPENT IN INSTRUCTION UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES IN SUMMER SCHOOL?

Summer school directors and staff asked that some extra analyses be done on the first-grade observation data on instructional time. Overall, 51% of the allocated instructional time was spent on instruction (with the first day excluded). Additional breakdowns revealed that:

- Only 30% of the time spent in the library by first graders was coded as instructional.
- Only 34% of the allocated instructional time was spent on instruction at the one campus observed the first day of summer school.
- The two campuses that split reading or math classes into two parts at the first-grade level spent about the same percentage of time on instruction (53.5%) as those that did not (50%).

These results suggest that efforts to increase time spent directly in instruction during library time and the first day of summer school are desirable. At the first-grade level, efforts to make students more accountable for what they read in the library and for the content and ideas in films might help to increase reading instructional time. On the first day of class, some time must be devoted to introductions, directions, and other start-up activities, but efforts should be made to begin instruction as soon as possible (especially in a short 24-day program).

The expectation was that splitting reading or math class into two parts would reduce instructional time. This was not supported by the first-grade observation data. However, these results cannot be intrepreted to mean that split scheduling does not matter, since differences in the experience and characteristics of staff, school facilities, and observation schedules could also account for these results. In addition, observations were conducted only at the first-grade level, and schools with split schedules had such schedules only half the time (for half the students at one campus or for one class for all students at the other).

Appendix B provides more detailed results.

WHAT DID PROGRAM STAFF VIEW AS PROGRAM STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES?

Summer school directors and coordinators met with the Director of Elementary Management and evaluation staff in September to discuss the summer school's strengths and weaknesses. Teachers were surveyed about their opinions on key aspects of the program during the last week of the summer session. Staff all viewed the program as strong. Among its strengths were:

- the mastery curriculums in reading and math,
- the bilingual curriculum;
- the inservice sessions, which seemed more specific than last year's;
- the smaller campus and class sizes;
- the timeline for enrollment and summer school and the registration process in general (much improved over last year);
- the amount of preplanning;
- the support services from summer school secretaries, librarians, the nurse, coordinators, Community School, transportation, evaluation, and all departments involved;
- the reinforcers used, especially calculators and scented stickers;
- the report cards and teacher data cards (although some were not completely filled in);
- the home visits (although a few teachers had a negative reaction to them);
- the teachers' enthusiasm and willingness to work;
- the snack break, which allowed a necessary "energy" break and gave some students their first meal of the day.

Some of the changes considered to improve weaker areas included:

- some adjustments in the reading curriculum at grade 1 (to increase emphasis on comprehension) and grades 4 and 5 (to deal with non-readers);
- more low-level calculator activities and better communication of ways to raise expectations for achievement in math;
- adjustments to the criteria for program eligibility (allowing "borderline" low achievers to be served, specifying clearly which special education students are eligible);
- assuring that parents understand the policy on summer school and promotion;
- encouraging teachers to indicate the students' functional grade level on report cards;
- considering serving a smaller number of grade levels (possibly grades 1 through 4 or kindergarten through 4) or restricting the number of campuses with fifth and sixth graders (enrollment was low at these grades);
- spreading teachers with summer school experience evenly across campuses;

- paying teachers for eight hours the last day to allow time for packing of materials and clean up, and notifying them if home visits are expected;
- finding better ways to build on skills learned in summer school during the regular school year;
- finding ways to schedule community school activities to avoid staggered schedules and split periods at some campuses (perhaps by making sure other Community School activities are scheduled for the mornings at each campus, and/or shortening the Community School activities to 30 minutes);
- finding ways to improve participation in followup activities or dropping this component;
- considering starting summer school one week later and having it last six weeks rather than five;
- considering eliminating librarians and limiting bus monitors to buses that transport 35 students or more;
- creating an early-ordering system for supplies and earlier arrival for reading materials, as well as a more organized and better-timed pickup system.

Some of the unanticipated outcomes of the summer school were:

- the positive changes in attitude toward school of the students;
- the fact that bilingual students were lower functioning than expected but very eager to learn;
- the relatively low percentage of time spent directly in reading and math instruction.

Discussions of modified eligibility requirements and ways to increase instructional time for 1984 have already begun.

WHAT WAS THE SUMMER SCHOOL CALENDAR?

Figure 1 shows the final summer-school calendar. It should be noted that although summer school registration officially closed May 13, some students were added after this date because room was still available.

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
DIVISION OF INSTRUCTION
DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY MANAGEMENT

SUMMER SCHOOL 1983
TIME LINE

DATE	ACTIVITY
MARCH 16	SEND TEACHER AND DIRECTOR APPLICATIONS
MARCH 25	COMMUNICATION ABOUT SUMMER SCHOOL SHARED WITH PARENTS
MARCH 30	DIRECTOR APPLICATIONS RETURNED TO HERMELINDA RODRIGUEZ
APRIL 5	SELECT DIRECTORS
APRIL 5	TEACHER APPLICATIONS RETURNED TO PERRY JACKSON
APRIL 8	NOTIFY DIRECTORS IF SELECTED OR NOT SELECTED
APRIL 8	SELECT TEACHERS
APRIL 18	SEND REGISTRATION FORMS AND STUDENT DATA CARDS TO SCHOOLS FOR TEACHERS
MAY 2	TEACHERS MAY BEGIN DISTRIBUTING REGISTRATION FORMS TO PARENTS
APRIL 20	NOTIFY TEACHERS IF SELECTED OR NOT SELECTED
MAY 13	REGISTRATION CLOSES
MAY 16	PRINCIPAL COLLECTS A REGISTRATION FORM AND A DATA CARD FOR EACH STUDENT REGISTERED AND SENDS THEM TO CARRUTH ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DIVISION OF ELEMENTARY INSTRUCTION. FEES ARE COLLECTED IN OFFICE OF LOCAL CAMPUS AND PUT IN LOCAL CLEARING ACCOUNT. A RECEIPT IS GIVEN PARENT.
MAY 14	SATURDAY IN-SERVICE (HALF-DAY, A.M.)
MAY 23	NOTICE TO STUDENTS WITH SUMMER SCHOOL ASSIGNMENT (SENT TO SCHOOLS TO DISTRIBUTE)
MAY 30	PRINCIPAL SENDS CHECK FOR FEES COLLECTED TO FINANCE OFFICE (MAKE CHECK PAYABLE TO AISD)
MAY 30	NO REFUNDS OF FEES AFTER THIS DATE. ALL REFUNDS WILL BE MADE AT LOCAL CAMPUS ONLY.
MAY 30	TEACHER IN-SERVICE MAY 14, SATURDAY - ½ DAY, A.M. MAY 31, TUESDAY - ½ DAY, A.M. JUNE 2, THURSDAY - 1 DAY, A.M. & P.M. MAY 31, TUESDAY - 3 HRS., HOME VISITS JUNE 1, WEDNESDAY - 7 HRS., HOME VISITS JUNE 3, FRIDAY - 1 DAY, PLANNING & PREPARATION TIME AT TEACHING SITE
JUNE 6 - JULY 8	SUMMER SCHOOL IN SESSION 8:30 - 12:30 (JULY 4 OFF)
SEPT.30, DEC.2, JUNE 30	TEA REPORTS DUE

Figure 1. SUMMER SCHOOL 1983 TIME LINE.

Summer School Second Report

Appendix A

Teacher Checklist

INSTRUMENT DESCRIPTION: Teacher Checklist

Brief Description of the instrument: The Retainee Checklist rates retainee's reading and math skills and behavior in the classroom. It includes five items related to academic skills, and 12 related to behavior. Teachers rated selected retainees compared to other students in their fall 1983 classrooms.

To whom was the instrument administered?

The teachers of a total of 250 retainees from 1982-83 -- 125 who attended summer school and 125 who had not.

How many times was the instrument administered?

Once with a reminder.

When was the instrument administered?

October 6, 1983 with a reminder sent on October 18, 1983.

Where was the instrument administered?

Surveys were sent to the principals of the students' 1983-84 school for delivery to teachers. Teachers generally completed surveys in their classroom.

Who administered the instrument?

Self-administered.

What training did the administrators have?

Written directions on the checklist.

Was the instrument administered under standardized conditions?

No.

Were there problems with the instrument or the administration that might affect the validity of the data?

None that are known.

Who developed the instrument?

Office of Research and Evaluation staff with input from elementary administrators.

What reliability and validity data are available on the instrument?

The "behavior" section is based on the Behavior Rating Checklist. Its reliability based on Cronback Alpha Coefficients of internal consistency is .87 and .94 for the two factors measured. Test-retest reliabilities between October and May were .71 and .70. A validity study showed that the scale can distinguish between students of different types.

Are there norm data available for interpreting the results?

Last year's results are available for comparison to this year's results.

Teacher Checklist

Purpose

The Teacher Checklist was designed to provide information on the following evaluation question:

> Evaluation Question D1-4: How do the reading and math skills and behavior of retainees who did and did not attend summer school compare as of fall 1983?

The original request of TEA was for fall testing of students with the same test used last spring. However, costs and logistics prohibited this testing because students returned to any of 61 elementary campuses after summer school. TEA granted permission to substitute a teacher rating checklist, and this was conducted for this year's and last year's evaluation. The Teacher Checklist used this year is the same as last year's except for the deletion of a few questions. Skill areas rated match Iowa Tests of Basic Skills areas tested.

Procedure

Basically, 250 1982-83 retainees were selected for the sample. Half had attended summer school while the other half had not. The fall teachers of these students were sent a Retainee Checklist in which they rated the reading skills, math skills, and behavior of the student compared to the other students in the class. (See Attachment A-1.)

Surveys were sent out October 6 and were checked in as received. Principals were asked to distribute the surveys since teacher codes for each student were not yet known. A reminder was sent out on October 19. The cutoff date for receiving questionnaires was November 1. The surveys were taken to Southwest Educational Development Laboratory to be keypunched and verified.

Analyses. Generally, basic summary statistics were generated. Computer programs were run to:

1. Calculate the number and percent giving each response, with sample sizes determined separately for each item. These calculations were done for the overall group, those attending summer school, and those not attending summer school.

2. Determine the percent responding 1, 2, 3; 4, 5, 6; and 7, 8, 9 for each item (summer-school and non summer-school groups). In addition to these groups overall, these percentages were also done for first graders, second graders, and third through sixth graders combined on the skill questions. Chi-squares were computed with a calculator to compare 1982-83 summer-school and nonsummer-school retainees and 1982-83 versus 1981-82 summer-school retainees.

3. Calculate mean ratings on behavior for the Ready, Willing, and Able scale (RWA = 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 9, 10) and Disruptive Classroom Behavior scale (DCB = 4, 6, 7). Items 1 and 3 were reversed before tabulation. All ratings available were averaged if some were missing for a child. Means were calculated separately for summer school attenders and nonattenders.

4. Determine counts of summer school attenders and nonattenders returning surveys by grade level. Grades were based on the Student Master File.

Attachment A-2 shows the card file layout.

Results

Return Rate

A total of 243 (97.2%) of the 250 surveys were returned. Six surveys were not usable because the students had been promoted (3) or left AISD (3), so the number of usable surveys was 237 (94.8% of the original sample). Teachers responded about 118 retainees who attended summer school and 119 who did not.

By grade, the number and percent responding was:

Grade	Number	Percent
Kindergarten	2	.8
1	130	54.9
2	42	17.7
3	21	8.9
4	21	8.9
5	12	5.1
6	9	3.8

Response rates closely approximate retention and summer school enrollment rates.

There was little difference in the number or percent responding according to summer school participation or nonparticipation.

Skills Ratings

Complete responses to each item for the overall group, the retainees who attended summer school, and the retainees who did not attend summer school are shown in Attachment A-3. Figure A-1 shows skill ratings for summer school attenders and nonattenders grouped as low (9, 8, 7), average (6, 5, 4), or high (3, 2, 1). Attachment A-4 shows chi square calculations.

RETAINEES IN SUMMER SCHOOL

REMINDER!!

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
Office of Research and Evaluation

RETAINEE CHECKLIST Your Name: _____

One of the questions addressed in the evaluation of the retention/promotion policy this year is how the retainees are functioning in Austin ISD classrooms this fall. We would appreciate your help in rating the skills and behavior of the retainee listed above-compared to other students in your class this fall. Base your ratings on your experiences so far this year.

SKILLS: Circle the number indicating this child's skills in the following areas compared to others in your class.

LOW = 9, 8, 7
AVERAGE = 6, 5, 4
HIGH = 3, 2, 1

		9 8 7 Low	6 5 4 Average	3 2 1 High
1. Reading comprehension	N=115	21.7%	54.8%	23.5%
2. Vocabulary	N=113	19.5%	58.4%	22.1%
3. Math concepts	N=114	27.2%	57.0%	15.8%
4. Math problem solving	N=112	23.2%	57.1%	19.6%
5. Math computation	N=114	29.8%	56.1%	14.0%

BEHAVIOR: Rate each behavior according to the frequency with which the student exhibits that behavior. Circle a number from 1 to 9 for each behavior description.

BEHAVIOR: 1, 2, 3 = Seldom or never
4, 5, 6 = Occasionally
7, 8, 9 = Frequently

		1 2 3 ↓ There has been no evidence of this behavior.	4 5 6 ↓ This behavior occurs occasionally.	7 8 9 ↓ This behavior is frequent and typical.
1. Student demands extra time from the teacher for help.	N=118	51.7%	38.1%	10.2%
2. Student understands and follows directions.	N=116	15.5%	28.4%	56.0%
3. Student quits or gives up on assignments before completion.	N=117	67.5%	22.2%	10.3%
4. Student bothers others while they are working.	N=118	55.9%	20.3%	23.7%
5. Student brings things to class, initiates discussions, shows imagination.	N=118	39.8%	34.7%	25.4%
6. Student breaks classroom or school rules.	N=118	49.2%	34.7%	16.1%
7. Student must be reprimanded during class time.	N=117	50.4%	32.5%	17.1%
8. Student does what the teacher asks without complaint or delay.	N=117	22.2%	24.8%	53.0%
9. Student is prepared and able to participate in class activities, lessons, discussion, etc.	N=117	14.5%	28.2%	57.3%
10. Student completes work on time and in good order.	N=118	16.1%	20.3%	63.6%
11. Student complains that other students tease him/her.	N=117	71.8%	17.1%	11.1%
12. Student provides leadership voluntarily in some class activities.	N=118	25.4%	41.5%	33.1%

Thank you! Please return through school mail no later than October 31 to:

ADM. BLDG., ORE Belinda O. Turner

Figure A-1. TEACHER RATINGS OF RETAINEES' SKILLS AND CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR. Students repeated a grade in 1983-84; half attended the 1983 summer school; the other half did not. Ratings were done in October 1983. (Page 1 of 2)

REMINDER!!

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
Office of Research and Evaluation

RETAINEES NOT IN SUMMER SCHOOL	
SKILLS	LOW = 9,8,7 AVERAGE = 6,5,4 HIGH = 3,2,1

RETAINEE CHECKLIST Your Name: _____

One of the questions addressed in the evaluation of the retention/promotion policy this year is how the retainees are functioning in Austin ISD classrooms this fall. We would appreciate your help in rating the skills and behavior of the retainee listed above compared to other students in your class this fall. Base your ratings on your experiences so far this year.

SKILLS: Circle the number indicating this child's skills in the following areas compared to others in your class.

		9 8 7 Low	6 5 4 Average	3 2 1 High
1. Reading comprenension	N=114	14.9%	63.2%	21.9%
2. Vocabulary	N=115	12.2%	63.5%	24.3%
3. Math concepts	N=115	18.3%	62.6%	19.1%
4. Math problem solving	N=113	15.0%	61.1%	23.9%
5. Math computation	N=113	22.1%	58.4%	19.5%

BEHAVIOR: Rate each behavior according to the frequency with which the student exhibits that behavior. Circle a number from 1 to 9 for each behavior description.

BEHAVIOR: 1, 2, 3 = Seldom or never; 4, 5, 6 = Occasionally; 7, 8, 9 = Frequently		1 2 3 ↓ There has been no evidence of this behavior.	4 5 6 ↓ This behavior occurs occasionally.	7 8 9 ↓ This behavior is frequent and typical.
1. Student demands extra time from the teacher for help.	N=118	44.9%	32.2%	22.9%
2. Student understands and follows directions.	N=119	16.0%	31.9%	52.1%
3. Student quits or gives up on assignments before completion.	N=118	66.9%	17.8%	15.3%
4. Student bothers others while they are working.	N=118	50.0%	26.3%	23.7%
5. Student brings things to class, initiates discussions, shows imagination.	N=118	40.7%	39.8%	19.5%
6. Student breaks classroom or school rules.	N=118	48.3%	33.1%	18.6%
7. Student must be reprimanded during class time.	N=117	47.9%	29.1%	23.1%
8. Student does what the teacher asks without complaint or delay.	N=119	24.4%	27.7%	47.9%
9. Student is prepared and able to participate in class activities, lessons, discussion, etc.	N=119	19.3%	36.1%	44.5%
10. Student completes work on time and in good order.	N=119	17.6%	32.8%	49.6%
11. Student complains that other students tease him/her.	N=118	80.5%	13.6%	5.9%
12. Student provides leadership voluntarily in some class activities.	N=119	32.8%	39.5%	27.7%

Thank you! Please return through school mail no later than October 31 to:

ADM. BLDG., ORE Belinda O. Turner

Figure A-1. TEACHER RATINGS OF RETAINEES' SKILLS AND CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR. Students repeated a grade in 1983-84; half attended the 1983 summer school; the other half did not. Ratings were done in October 1983. (Page 2 of 2)

In reviewing skill ratings, it is important to remember that vocabulary was emphasized only at grade one with reading comprehension emphasized at the rest of the grades. In math, concepts and problem solving were emphasized--computation was not. Percentages shown in Figure A-1 suggest that retainees who attended summer school were a little more likely to be rated low or average than retainees who did not attend summer school. However, chi squares reveal that these differences are nonsignificant--that is, differences were no greater than those expected to occur by chance (see Attachment A-4).

Chi squares comparing the 1981-82 and 1982-83 summer-school retainees' ratings in the summer-school areas emphasized revealed a significant difference only in reading comprehension. The 1981-82 retainees appeared to be rated average more often than the 1982-83 retainees, while the 1982-83 retainees were rated high or low more often.

Percentages of low, average, and high ratings given to 1982-83 summer school attenders and nonattenders in grades one, two, and three through six are shown in Attachment A-5. Percentages suggest that first-grade retainees who went to summer school were more likely to be rated low compared to those who did not go. Second-grade retainees who went to summer school appeared more likely to be rated average. However, although chi squares were not calculated, it appears unlikely any of these differences were significant.

Behavior Ratings

Attachment A-3 and Figure A-1 provide results. The behaviors most often rated as occurring fairly frequently (ratings of 7, 8, and 9) were:

2) Student understands and follows directions (54%).
8) Student does what the teacher asks without complaint or delay (50%).
9) Student is prepared and able to participate in class activities, lessons, discussion, etc. (51%).
10) Student completes work on time and in good order (57%).

The only behavior most often rated as occurring occasionally was:

12) Student provides leadership voluntarily in some class activities (41%).

The rest of the behaviors were most often rated as never occurring or occurring infrequently:

1) Student demands extra help from the teacher for help (48%).
3) Student quits or gives up on assignments before completion (67%).
4) Student bothers others while they are working (53%).
5) Student brings things to class, initiates discussions, shows imagination (40%).
6) Studen breaks classroom or school rules (49%).
7) Student must be reprimanded during class time (49%).
11) Student complains that other students teas him/her (76%).

These behavioral trends were quite similar to those found last year. However, last year students were described as demanding extra help from the teacher somewhat more often than this year. Also, students were described as providing leadership voluntarily les often last year.

Some behaviors listed as occurring infrequently or never last year were even less frequent this year. Retainees were less frequently described as quitting on assignments, bothering others while they worked, or complaining that others teased them. They were more likely to be described as bringing things to class, initiating discussions and showing imagination compared to last year.

Thus, the majority of the retainees appear to be fairly cooperative students. They understand and follow directions, complete work, and are prepared for class. They seldom give up on assignments, bother others, break rules, require reprimands, or demand extra help from the teacher. On the negative side, the retainees seldom bring things to class, initiate discussions, or show imagination, and only occasionally provide leadership voluntarily.

Of course, it must be kept in mind that about half of the students do not follow this pattern. For example, while 60% are described as bringing things to class, initiating discussions, and showing imagination occasionally or frequently, over one third never or seldom show this behavior.

Comparisons of behavior ratings of retainees who did and did not attend summer school were made in terms of mean ratings on the Ready, Willing, and Able (RWA) scale (Items 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 9, and 10 with 1 and 3 reversed) and the Disruptive Classroom Behavior (DCB) scale (Item 4, 6, and 7). Items 11 and 12 are not part of either scale.

83.04

Mean ratings on the Ready, Willing, and Able (RWA) and Disruptive Classroom Behavior (DCB) scales were as follows:

GROUP	MEAN		N	
Ready, Willing and Able (RWA)	82-83	81-82	82-83	81-82
Summer School Attenders	6.1	6.0	118	72
Summer School Nonattenders	5.8	5.9	119	66
Disruptive Classroom Behavior Scale (DCB)	82-83	81-82	82-83	81-82
Summer School Attenders	3.9	4.6	118	72
Summer School Nonattenders	4.0	3.9	119	66

Ratings reveal that:

- On the average, retainees were rated as ready, willing, and able to participate in classroom activities on an occasional basis. There was only a very small difference in the ratings of summer school attenders and nonattenders; this was in favor of those who did attend. Ratings were very similar to those of last year.
- Disruptive behavior appears to occur only occasionally for all retainees regardless of whether they attended summer school or not. The only change from last year was a decrease in frequency of disruptive behavior among retainees attending summer school.

83.04

AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT
Office of Research and Evaluation

Attachment A-1

RETAINEE CHECKLIST Your Name: _____

One of the questions addressed in the evaluation of the retention/promotion policy this year is how the retainees are functioning in Austin ISD classrooms this fall. We would appreciate your help in rating the skills and behavior of the retainee listed above compared to other students in your class this fall. Base your ratings on your experiences so far this year.

SKILLS: Circle the number indicating this child's skills in the following areas compared to others in your class.

	Extremely Low			Average				Extremely High	
1. Reading comprehension	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
2. Vocabulary	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
3. Math concepts	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
4. Math problem solving	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
5. Math computation	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

BEHAVIOR: Rate each behavior according to the frequency with which the student exhibits that behavior. Circle a number from 1 to 9 for each behavior description.

	There has been no evidence of this behavior. ↓				This behavior occurs occasionally. ↓				This behavior is frequent and typical. ↓
1. Student demands extra time from the teacher for help.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2. Student understands and follows directions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3. Student quits or gives up on assignments before completion.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
4. Student bothers others while they are working.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5. Student brings things to class, initiates discussions, shows imagination.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
6. Student breaks classroom or school rules.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
7. Student must be reprimanded during class time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
8. Student does what the teacher asks without complaint or delay.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
9. Student is prepared and able to participate in class activities, lessons, discussion, etc.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10. Student completes work on time and in good order.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
11. Student complains that other students tease him/her.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
12. Student provides leadership voluntarily in some class activities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Thank you! Please return through school mail no later than October 31 to:

ADM. BLDG., ORE Belinda O. Turner

FILE ID A, V, A CARD FILE LAYOUT LOCATION ORE

NAME Nancy S., Carol P. DATE 10/10/83

COMMENTS Retainee Checklist Responses, 1983-84

FIELD	COLUMNS	DESCRIPTION
A	1 - 3	FILE ID (Same on all cards)
B	4 - 10	First 7 letters of student's last name (left justified)
C	11 - 11	Grade
D	12 - 14	Sequence Number (right justify--add leading 0's for 1 or 2 digit numbers)
E	15 - 15	Blank
F	16 - 20	Responses to skills items 1 through 5; Number circled (1-9); Blank = Blank; If two numbers
	-	are circled, mark most extreme number (e.g. 1 and 2 = 1; 8 and 9 = 9)
G	21 - 32	Responses to items 1 through 12 (Behavior); Code number circled (1-9); Blank = Blank;
	-	Code highest number circled if two are marked (e.g. 4 and 5 = 5)
	-	
	-	
	-	
	-	
	-	
	-	
	-	
	-	
	-	
	21	

TOTAL # OF RETAINEE CHECKLISTS RETURNED= 237 OVERALL RESPONSES FOR ALL RETAINEES

QUESTION #	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	N
1	4 1.7%	10 4.4%	26 11.5%	16 7.0%	88 38.9%	31 13.7%	29 12.8%	14 6.2%	8 3.5%	226
2	2 .9%	11 4.8%	22 9.6%	28 12.3%	72 31.6%	39 17.1%	40 17.5%	10 4.4%	3 1.3%	228
3	4 1.7%	21 9.2%	27 11.8%	34 14.8%	70 30.6%	33 14.4%	27 11.8%	9 3.9%	4 1.7%	229
4	3 1.3%	16 7.1%	24 10.7%	31 13.8%	63 28.0%	39 17.3%	29 12.9%	11 4.9%	9 4.0%	225
5	8 3.5%	23 10.1%	28 12.3%	34 15.0%	70 30.8%	26 11.5%	27 11.9%	7 3.1%	4 1.8%	227
6	59 25.0%	34 14.4%	21 8.9%	19 8.1%	56 23.7%	8 3.4%	18 7.6%	7 3.0%	14 5.9%	236
7	9 3.8%	14 6.0%	14 6.0%	21 8.9%	31 13.2%	19 8.1%	48 20.4%	46 19.6%	33 14.0%	235
8	93 39.6%	43 18.3%	22 9.4%	20 8.5%	23 9.8%	4 1.7%	11 4.7%	10 4.3%	9 3.8%	235
9	65 27.8%	39 16.7%	21 8.9%	12 5.1%	34 14.4%	9 3.8%	22 9.3%	11 4.7%	23 9.7%	236
10	37 15.7%	31 13.2%	27 11.4%	26 11.0%	48 20.3%	14 5.9%	19 8.1%	17 7.2%	17 7.2%	236
11	52 22.0%	45 19.1%	18 7.6%	25 10.6%	40 16.9%	15 6.4%	11 4.7%	16 6.8%	14 5.9%	236
12	52 22.2%	47 20.1%	16 6.8%	24 10.3%	36 15.4%	12 5.1%	17 7.3%	16 6.8%	14 6.0%	234
13	21 8.9%	19 8.1%	15 6.4%	20 8.5%	26 11.0%	16 6.8%	25 10.6%	43 18.2%	51 21.6%	236
14	13 5.5%	11 4.7%	16 6.8%	16 6.8%	43 18.2%	17 7.2%	42 17.8%	43 18.2%	35 14.8%	236
15	12 5.1%	10 4.2%	18 7.6%	19 8.0%	24 10.1%	20 8.4%	41 17.3%	48 20.3%	45 19.0%	237
16	151 65.7%	26 11.3%	22 9.6%	9 3.9%	21 9.1%	6 2.6%	7 3.0%	2 .9%	11 4.8%	235
17	23 11.0%	19 9.0%	22 10.5%	19 9.0%	55 26.2%	13 6.2%	26 12.4%	20 9.5%	13 6.2%	210

Microfilmed From
Best Available Copy

OF RETIRED CHECKLIST RESPONDENTS IN SUMMER SCHOOL= 118

QUESTION #	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	N
1	1 1.9%	9 4.3%	19 10.3%	7 6.1%	42 36.5%	14 12.2%	19 16.5%	5 4.3%	3 2.6%	115
2	2 1.8%	4 3.5%	16 14.2%	14 12.4%	35 31.0%	17 15.0%	22 19.5%	3 2.7%	0 0.0%	113
3	2 1.8%	10 8.8%	19 16.7%	19 16.7%	32 28.1%	14 12.3%	14 12.3%	2 1.8%	2 1.8%	114
4	1 0.9%	8 7.1%	17 15.2%	13 11.6%	29 25.9%	17 15.2%	12 10.7%	6 5.4%	4 3.6%	112
5	5 4.4%	13 11.4%	16 14.0%	19 16.7%	33 28.9%	12 10.5%	12 10.5%	2 1.8%	2 1.8%	114
6	22 19.1%	16 13.9%	13 11.3%	8 6.9%	34 29.6%	3 2.6%	6 5.2%	2 1.7%	4 3.4%	116
7	4 3.4%	7 6.0%	7 6.0%	8 6.9%	15 12.9%	10 8.6%	23 19.8%	20 22.4%	15 13.8%	116
8	48 41.0%	22 18.8%	9 7.7%	11 9.4%	12 10.3%	3 2.6%	5 4.3%	4 3.4%	3 2.6%	117
9	31 26.5%	19 16.2%	20 17.1%	3 2.6%	15 12.8%	3 2.6%	10 8.5%	7 5.9%	11 9.4%	118
10	14 11.9%	17 14.4%	16 13.6%	13 11.0%	23 19.5%	9 7.6%	13 11.0%	7 5.9%	13 9.5%	118
11	26 22.0%	22 18.6%	10 8.5%	12 10.2%	20 16.9%	9 7.6%	9 7.6%	7 5.9%	9 7.6%	118
12	27 24.8%	24 20.5%	9 7.7%	9 7.7%	18 15.4%	11 9.4%	7 6.0%	7 6.0%	6 5.1%	117
13	13 11.1%	6 5.1%	7 6.0%	9 7.7%	9 7.7%	11 9.4%	12 10.3%	22 18.8%	29 25.9%	117
14	7 6.0%	2 1.7%	3 2.6%	0 0.0%	17 14.5%	8 6.8%	27 23.1%	24 20.5%	19 16.2%	117
15	7 5.9%	3 2.5%	7 5.9%	11 9.3%	6 5.1%	7 5.9%	25 21.2%	29 24.6%	21 17.8%	118
16	61 52.1%	13 11.1%	10 8.5%	5 4.3%	12 10.3%	3 2.6%	4 3.4%	0 0.0%	9 7.7%	117
17	8 6.8%	13 11.0%	9 7.6%	9 7.6%	28 24.0%	11 9.3%	16 13.6%	14 11.9%	9 7.6%	117

Microfilmed From
Best Available Copy

OF RETAINEE CHECKLIST RESPONDENTS NOT IN SUMMER SCHOOL= 119

QUESTION #	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	N
1	3 2.6%	5 4.4%	9 7.9%	9 7.9%	46 40.4%	17 14.9%	10 8.8%	9 7.9%	6 5.3%	114
2	1 0.9%	7 6.1%	6 5.2%	14 12.2%	37 32.2%	22 19.1%	18 15.7%	7 6.1%	3 2.6%	115
3	2 1.7%	11 9.6%	8 7.0%	15 13.0%	38 33.0%	19 16.5%	13 11.3%	7 6.1%	2 1.7%	115
4	2 1.8%	8 7.1%	7 6.2%	13 11.5%	34 30.1%	22 19.5%	17 15.0%	5 4.4%	5 4.4%	113
5	3 2.7%	10 9.0%	12 10.8%	15 13.5%	37 33.3%	14 12.6%	15 13.5%	5 4.5%	2 1.8%	111
1	27 22.5%	18 15.0%	8 6.8%	11 9.2%	22 18.3%	5 4.2%	12 10.0%	5 4.2%	13 10.8%	120
2	5 4.2%	7 5.9%	7 5.9%	13 10.9%	16 13.4%	9 7.6%	25 21.0%	20 16.8%	17 14.3%	119
3	45 38.1%	21 17.8%	13 11.0%	9 7.6%	11 9.3%	1 0.8%	6 5.1%	6 5.1%	6 5.1%	118
4	34 28.8%	20 16.9%	5 4.2%	9 7.6%	16 13.6%	0 5.1%	12 10.2%	4 3.4%	12 10.2%	118
5	23 19.5%	14 11.9%	11 9.3%	13 11.0%	28 23.7%	6 5.1%	6 5.1%	10 8.5%	7 5.9%	118
6	26 22.0%	23 19.5%	8 6.8%	13 11.0%	20 16.9%	6 5.1%	5 4.2%	9 7.6%	8 6.8%	118
7	23 19.7%	23 19.7%	10 8.5%	15 12.8%	18 15.4%	1 0.9%	10 8.5%	9 7.7%	8 6.8%	117
8	8 6.7%	13 10.9%	8 6.7%	11 9.2%	17 14.3%	5 4.2%	13 10.9%	21 17.6%	23 19.3%	119
9	6 5.0%	9 7.6%	8 6.7%	8 6.7%	26 21.8%	9 7.6%	15 12.6%	19 16.0%	19 16.0%	119
10	5 4.2%	7 5.9%	9 7.6%	8 6.7%	18 15.1%	13 10.9%	16 13.4%	19 16.0%	24 20.2%	119
11	70 59.3%	13 11.0%	12 10.2%	4 3.4%	9 7.6%	3 2.5%	3 2.5%	2 1.7%	2 1.7%	118
12	20 16.9%	6 5.0%	13 10.9%	10 8.4%	30 25.2%	7 5.9%	10 8.4%	12 10.1%	11 9.2%	119

Microfilmed From
Best Available Copy

CHI SQUARES 1982-83 SUMMER-SCHOOL
VERSUS NONSUMMER-SCHOOL ATTENDERS

READING COMPREHENSION

		LOW	AVERAGE	HIGH	
Summer school	o	25	63	27	115
	e	21	68	26	
Non summer school	o	17	72	25	114
	e	21	67	26	
		42	135	52	229

o = observed e = expected

$$x^2 = \frac{(25-21)^2}{21} + \frac{(63-68)^2}{68} + \frac{(27-26)^2}{26} + \frac{(17-21)^2}{21} + \frac{(72-67)^2}{67} + \frac{(25-26)^2}{25} =$$

$$\frac{16}{21} + \frac{25}{68} + \frac{1}{26} + \frac{16}{21} + \frac{25}{67} + \frac{1}{25} =$$

$$.76 + .37 + .04 + .76 + .37 + .04 = 2.34 \quad \text{N.S.}$$

df = 2
Sig. .05 = 5.99
Sig. .01 = 9.21

READING VOCABULARY

		LOW	AVERAGE	HIGH	
Non summer school	o	14	73	28	115
	e	18	70	27	
Summer school	o	22	66	25	113
	e	18	69	26	
		36	139	53	228

$x^2 = 2.12$ N.S.

MATH CONCEPTS

		LOW	AVERAGE	HIGH	
Non summer school	o	21	72	22	115
	e	26	69	20	
Summer school	o	31	65	18	114
	e	26	68	20	
		52	137	40	229

$x^2 = 2.58$ N.S.

MATH PROBLEM SOLVING

		LOW	AVERAGE	HIGH	
Non summer school	o	17	69	27	113
	e	22	67	25	
Summer school	o	26	64	22	112
	e	21	66	24	
		43	133	49	225

$x^2 = 2.04$ N.S.

1981-82 VS 1982-83 RETAINEES WHO ATTENDED SUMMER SCHOOL

READING COMPREHENSION

		LOW	AVERAGE	HIGH	
Summer school 81-82		5	43	7	55
		10	34	11	
Summer school 82-83		25	63	27	115
		20	72	23	
		30	106	34	170

x^2 = 9.4 SIG. (.01 level)

VOCABULARY

		LOW	AVERAGE	HIGH	
Summer school 81-82	o	12	45	13	70
	e	13	42	15	
Summer school	o	22	66	25	113
	e	21	69	23	
		34	111	38	183

x^2 = .8 N.S.

MATH CONCEPTS

		LOW	AVERAGE	HIGH	
Summer school 81-82	o	9	47	14	70
	e	15	43	12	
Summer school 82-83	o	31	65	18	114
	e	25	69	20	
		40	112	32	184

x^2 = 4.97 N.S.

MATH PROBLEM SOLVING

		LOW	AVERAGE	HIGH	
Summer school 81-82	o	15	41	13	69
	e	16	40	13	
Summer school 82-83	o	26	64	22	112
	e	25	65	22	
		41	105	35	181

x^2 = .15 N.S.

MATH COMPUTATION

		LOW	AVERAGE	HIGH	
Non summer school	o	25	66	22	113
	e	29	65	19	
Summer School	o	34	64	16	114
	e	30	65	19	
		59	130	38	227

x^2 = 1.95 N.S.

QUESTION #	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	N
1	16 24.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	39 60.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	10 15.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	65
2	14 21.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	41 63.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	10 15.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	65
3	23 35.9%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	32 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	9 14.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	64
4	19 30.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	33 53.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	10 16.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	62
5	22 34.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	33 51.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	9 14.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	64

A-19

OF GRADE 1 NON-SUMMER SCHOOL KITS RESPONDING = 63

QUESTION #	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	N
1	13 21.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	33 55.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	14 23.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	60
2	11 18.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	34 55.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	16 26.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	61
3	15 24.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	37 59.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	10 16.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	62
4	14 23.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	32 53.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	14 23.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	60
5	18 30.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	30 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	12 20.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	60

OF GRADE 2 SUMMER SCHOOL RETS RESPONDING = 21

QUESTION #	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	N
1	8 38.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	9 42.9%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 19.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	21
2	7 35.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	8 40.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5 25.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	20
3	7 35.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	11 55.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 10.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	20
4	6 30.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	11 55.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 15.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	20
5	8 40.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	10 50.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 10.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	20

OF GRADE 2 NON-SUMMER SCHOOL RETS RESPONDING = 21

QUESTION #	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	N
1	2 9.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	17 81.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 9.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	21
2	2 9.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	15 71.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	4 19.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	21
3	3 14.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	17 81.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 4.8%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	21
4	2 9.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	16 76.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	3 14.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	21
5	5 23.8%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	15 71.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 4.8%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	21

OF GRADE 3-6 SUMMER SCHOOL RETS RESPONDING = 30

QUESTION #	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	N
1	1 3.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	15 51.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	13 44.8%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	29
2	1 3.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	17 60.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	10 35.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	28
3	1 3.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	22 73.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	7 23.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	30
4	1 3.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	20 66.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	9 30.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	30
5	4 13.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	21 70.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	5 16.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	30

A-21

OF GRADE 3-6 NON-SUMMER SCHOOL RETS RESPONDING = 33

QUESTION #	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	N
1	2 6.5%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	21 67.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	8 25.8%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	31
2	1 3.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	23 74.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	7 22.6%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	31
3	3 10.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	16 53.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	11 36.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	30
4	1 3.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	19 63.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	10 33.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	30
5	2 6.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	19 63.3%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	9 30.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	30

Summer School Second Report

Appendix B

Observation Followup

83.04

INSTRUMENT DESCRIPTION: Observation Followup

Brief Description of the instrument: The Pupil Activities Record-Revised (PAR-R) is a systematic observation instrument designed to record all the activities of a student during an instructional day. Randomly selected students are observed for an entire day. Variables observed during summer school included: how often instruction occurred, what type of instruction occurred, adult contact, group size, students' on-task or off-task behavior, mode of instruction, and assessment activitiy. Further breakdowns of instructional versus non-instructional time in the library, on the first day of summer school, and by campus were done since the issue of the first report.

To whom was the instrument administered?

Twenty-four first-grade students.

How many times was the instrument administered?

Twenty-four times -- each student chosen was observed for one day during the three hours of scheduled reading and math time.

When was the instrument administered?

June 6 through July 8 — every day of the summer school.

Where was the instrument administered?

All summer school campuses: Becker, Brooke, Cook, Maplewood, Rosedale, and St. Elmo.

Who administered the instrument?

A graduate student from the University of Texas Department of Educational Psychology.

What training did the administrators have?

He reviewed the PAR-R manual and received several hours of training with the PAR-R coding videotapes. The evaluation assistant for the project also went out with him on the first day and compared results. He also had previous observation experience.

Was the instrument administered under standardized conditions?

All observations were conducted in first-grade classrooms, but classrooms varied somewhat.

Were there problems with the instrument or the administration that might affect the validity of the data?

It was sometimes difficult to distinguish assessment from instruction, but teachers were generally asked to clarify this at the end of class.

Who developed the instrument?

ORE staff.

What reliability and validity data are available on the instrument?

Interrater agreement on Basic Instruction variables was .77.

Are there norm data available for interpreting the results?

Data were collected on the same variables last year during the 1982 summer school for retainees.

Observation Followup

Purpose

Additional breakdowns of first-grade observation data collected with the Pupil Activities Record-Revised (PAR-R) were done to determine whether time spent on instruction and noninstruction varied from the overall rates in certain circumstances. Specifically:

- Was less time spent on instruction in the library?
- Was less time spent on instruction the first day of class?
- Was less time spent on instruction in schools with staggered schedules for grade on classes?

Procedure

Breakdowns of time spent on basic instruction, other instruction, and noninstruction were done for the following:

- Library time,
- First day of summer school (one observation only),
- Each campus every day but the first.

The schools each sent a copy of their daily schedules, and a determination was made of whether first-grade time for reading or math was staggered (split into two parts) or whether each class was taught in a 90-minute block.

The total number of minutes spent in noninstruction, basic instruction, and other instruction was then totalled for the two schools with staggered schedules at grade one and for the four without.

Results

How much of the allotted time was spent on instruction overall?

First-grade PAR-R observations indicated that, on the average, students spent *49%* of the allotted class time directly engaged in reading and math instruction plus *2%* in other instruction. The remaining *49%* of the time was spent in other activities (noninstruction).

Definitions of basic instruction, other instruction, and noninstruction used with the PAR-R are given in Attachment B-1. It is important to realize that:

- Only time actively spent teaching reading, math, or other skills counts as basic or other instruction.
- Non-instruction includes some activities that directly support instruction, like test-taking and noninstructional directions (e.g., "Take out your workbooks now"). Other types of noninstruction do not support instruction (e.g. waiting for the teacher).

Was less time spent on instruction in the library?

Yes. First graders spent 25% of their library time in reading instruction, 5% in other instruction, and 69% in noninstruction. This 30% instructional time figure is considerably less than the 51% instructional figure for all classroom time observed.

Possible reasons for this were discussed in the first final report summary and include:

- Time spent on films. Films were only counted as instructional if there was some clear tie to reading skills or followup on film content that built reading skills. This seldom happened at the first-grade level. Thus, a film about a book would only count as reading instruction if students were told to do things like identify the main characters, talk about the main idea of the story, act out the story, or something else directly related to reading skills.
- Library time was not as structured as class time, and some students spent a lot of time waiting for individual help or just looking at the pictures in books (or sitting). Students were seldom asked to report on what they had read or build on it in some other way at the first-grade level.

Library time spent in various subcategories included:

Category	Minutes	Percent
Noninstruction		
Directs	10	
Transition	28	69%
Class Control	1	
Other	145	
Other Instruction	14	5%
Reading Instruction	67	25%
	265	

Students usually visited the library once a week. The number of minutes spent in the library was about 12% of the reading time observed.

Was less time spent on instruction the first day of class?

Since there was only one observer this summer, data applicable to this question are based on one full-day observation at one campus. *At the campus observed, less time was spent on instruction the first day than during the overall program.* About 34% of the observed time was spent on instruction, with 66% spent on noninstruction.

Much of the noninstructional time was devoted to describing the program, giving expectations and rules, and getting acquainted. Students received no reading instruction during the allotted 90 minutes the first day and 52 minutes of math during the allotted 90 minutes (see Attachment B-2 for more detailed breakdowns).

While some time must be devoted to start-up activities, it seems advisable that instruction begin as soon as possible, especially in a short 24-day summer session.

Was less time spent on instruction in schools with staggered schedules for first-grade classes?

On the average, there seemed to be little difference in instructional time based on staggered or unstaggered scheduling at the first-grade level.

The guidelines for daily time use were that students spend:

- 90 minutes in reading instruction;
- 60 minutes in community school activities, snack, and restroom;
- 90 minutes in math instruction.

Community school activities and snacks were designed to break up the intense instructional blocks for reading and math and provide students with extra energy for the rest of the day. Thus, it was preferred that these activities occur during the middle of the morning session.

Each campus set their own schedule within these guidelines. Three of the six split reading or math classes into segments to accommodate community school activities and staffing. One of the six did not split reading or math class but reduced reading and math time for intermediate students to 80 minutes per day. Students had a 20-minute break in between classes and 60 minutes for community school at the end of the morning.

Schedules for each school along with breakdowns of instructional and noninstructional time are shown in Attachment B-3. School results will be less representative of the total summer program than totals across campuses since they are based on a limited number of observations on selected days.

Totals for the two campuses with staggered schedules at grade one (Brooke, Maplewood), and the four without such schedules (Cook, Becker, St. Elmo, and Rosedale) follow:

	Staggered Schedule		Nonstaggered Schedule	
	# Minutes	%	# Minutes	%
Basic Instruction	768	53	1,308	48
Other Instruction	7	.5	57	2
Noninstruction	665	46	1,335	49
	Total Observations = 8		Total Observations = 15	

Thus, little difference is evident in the percentage of time spent on instruction between the two scheduling arrangements based on these grade-one observations. *However, caution must be taken in interpreting these results.* One campus had staggered schedules for only half of the first graders and the other had a staggered schedule for all first graders but only for one class. The effects of the truly staggered part of their schedule could not be isolated. A wide variety of differences between campuses may have also influenced results, including differences in staff, school organization, and observation schedules.

- One of the campuses with a staggered first-grade schedule, for example, had the most teachers with experience last summer.
- One of the campuses without a staggered schedule, on the other hand, was the only "open-concept" school. Its director also had to leave due to a sudden illness, which may have reduced instructional time at the campus at least briefly.
- Early observations randomly fell more often on campuses with nonstaggered schedules. Instructional time would be expected to be a little lower at first while teachers and students adjusted to the new curriculum, school, and each other.
- Finally, grade one observations may not be representative of all summer-school grades.

83.04 PAR-R Definitions of Instructional Variables

A description of each of these variables is provided below.

Observed Variables Recorded on the PAR-R

PLACE (Place of Instruction)

In this section, the observer records the place where instruction was delivered for the minute preceding check-off. If instruction is delivered somewhere besides Classroom, Reading Laboratory, or School Library, the Other category should be used. The coding is done as described below:

C = Classroom
LAB = Reading Lab
LIB = Library
OTHER = Other

NON-INSTR (Activities During No Instruction)

This category contains the following five subcategories:

D = (1) Directs - Student under observation is listening to directions from teacher that are not instructional in nature--that is, directions related to *what the student is to do rather than how* the student should do something. Examples of noninstructional directions that would be coded under Directs - No instruction are: "Get out your book," "Don't open your books until I tell you to," "Now turn to page 95," and "Do problems 1-10." Examples of instructional directions would be "Match the words in column A with the words in column B that have the same meaning," or "Fill in the blanks with the words from the list on page five that will make the sentences true sentences." If a teacher directs students to copy down the information that she is going to write on the board, it would be coded as Directs - No Instruction (waiting) while the student waits for the teacher to write out the information. When the student begins to copy the information down, the appropriate subject under OTHER INSTR or BASIC should be coded. Generally the content coded would be "Other."

HC = (2) Housecleaning - Student under observation is involved in cleanup activities of some kind such as wiping down tables, throwing away papers, etc. This does not include transitional activities such as putting up materials and clearing desk for next activity.

CC = (4) Class Control - Teacher is engaged in classroom management which affects the student under observation so that no instructional activities are ocurring for the student.

T = (3) Transition - Student is involved in shifting from one activity to another. This would include putting up materials, getting out materials, moving from one area of the room to another, and erasing of blackboards in preparation for new activity. All lining-up time would be coded here, as would any time

between activities when the student is waiting for the teacher to initiate the new activity.

Note: *Time spent at the beginning of the day for "settling in," roll call, taking up lunch money, p.a. announcements, etc., would be coded under Other - No Instruction, not under Transition.*

0 = Other - Student under observation is not involved in instructional activity for some reason other than those listed in the four subcategories above. This would include waiting for teacher instruction other than during Transition. *The student is not receiving instruction for some reason that is out of the student's control.*
(5)

A special instance of No Instruction arises when the student under observation has been given "free time" or has finished the task assigned by the teacher. The student has no specific task other than to remain quiet and not disrupt other students. *If* the student chooses *not* to initiate an instructional activity such as reading a book or working on homework, the observer should record Noninstruction as Other. If the student initiates an instructional activity, the observer should record the activity as Ontask under the appropriate instructional area. Should the student cease the activity and engage in nondisruptive but noninstructional activity (e.g., staring out the window, talking quietly, etc.) the observer will again employ the No Instruction category, rather than the Offtask subcategory of the instructional area in which he/she had been working, since there was no assigned task to be offtask from.

OTHER INSTR (Other Instruction)

In this section the observer records the area of instruction of the student's activity when it is not in the BASIC SKILLS. The coding is done as described below:

A = Art
M = Music
PE = Physical Education (3)
LU = Lunch
BC = Between Class (5)
O = Other (6)
EXP = Extended PE (Formerly recess)

BASIC (Basic Skills Instruction)

In this section the observer records the Basic Skill area of instruction or the activity the student engages in. The observer selects categories for check off depending upon the student's *predominant* activity if more than one activity occurs within the one-minute time segment immediately preceding. In addition, for the basic skills categories (i.e., Reading/Language Arts, Mathematics, Social Studies, and Science), and for Undetermined, the observer records whether the student is ontask or offtask.

83.04

A description of each category, along with definitions of Ontask and Off-task follows:

R = Reading - Student is involved in some reading or language arts
(1) activity during time allocated for instruction in reading or language arts (e.g., reading aloud in a group, reading silently at desk, doing exercises in a spelling workbook, playing a language game, or doing writing exercises).

The viewing of educational television programs aimed at the development of language skills, such as Sesame Street, Electric Company, and Carrascolendas, should be recorded in the Reading/Language Arts category.

M = Mathematics - Student is engaged in activity related to mathematics
(2) (e.g., receiving instruction in mathematics, figuring solutions to problems, using mathematics-related materials, etc.).

SS = Social Studies - Student is engaged in activity related to social studies (e.g., receiving instruction in social studies, making and/or coloring a map, watching a social studies film or educational television program, researching a report for social studies in the library, etc.).

S = Science - Student is engaged in activity related to science (e.g., receiving instruction in science or health, working on science project, performing experiments, viewing film or educational television program, etc.).

? = Undetermined - Student is engaged in an instructional activity
(5) such as an educational game, whose nature is unclear to the observer. If the observer can eventually determine the nature of the activity, the coding should be changed to reflect the proper instructional area.

CG = Guidance Activities - The student is engaged in a guidance or counseling activity led by the counselor.

ADULT (Adult Contact)

Adult contact is recorded only when a BASIC category has been coded. To record Adult Contact, the observer records the adult(s) who had contact with the student under observation during the preceding minute. *The observer should record any adult contact regardless of its instructional content or length of occurrence.* (The contact does not have to have predominated during the preceding minute.)

If the student has contact with more than two adults, the observer should check off the categories corresponding to the two adults whose contact with the student was most predominant. If the student has contact with two classroom teachers, as will occur in team-teaching situations, the observer should record the first contact as classroom teacher. Contact with the second classroom teacher should be coded as "Other" and an explanation placed in the notes column.

83.04
SCHOOL: [redacted]

FIRST DAY ONLY

OF OBSERVATIONS= 1
TOTAL # OF MINUTES= 180
AVERAGE CLASS SIZE= 9.00

NON-INSTRUCTION

CODE	# MIN	%AGE		
1	26	14.44	DIRECTIONS	66.11%
3	11	6.11	TRANSITION	
5	82	45.56	OTHER	

BASIC INSTRUCTION

CODE	# MIN	%AGE		
2	52	28.89	MATH	33.89%
5	9	5.00	OTHER OR UNCODABLE	

OTHER INSTRUCTION

CODE	# MIN	%AGE

83.04

SCHOOL: [redacted] WITHOUT THE FIRST DAY

OF OBSERVATIONS= 4
TOTAL # OF MINUTES= 720
AVERAGE CLASS SIZE= 8.25

NON-INSTRUCTION

CODE	# MIN	%AGE		
1	29	4.03	DIRECTIONS	51.26%
2	2	0.28	HOUSECLEANING	
3	94	13.06	TRANSITION	
4	4	0.56	CLASS CONTROL	
5	240	33.33	OTHER	

BASIC INSTRUCTION

CODE	# MIN	%AGE		
1	161	22.36	READING	43.61%
2	150	20.83	MATH	
5	3	0.42		

OTHER INSTRUCTION

CODE	# MIN	%AGE		
5	4	0.56	BETWEEN CLASS	5.14%
6	33	4.58	OTHER	

Schedule
Not Staggered

90 minutes reading or math
reversed for ½ of kids { 30 minutes snack/rec/restroom
30 minutes community school
90 minutes reading or math

83.04

SCHOOL: [redacted]

WITHOUT THE FIRST DAY

OF OBSERVATIONS= 6
TOTAL # OF MINUTES=1080
AVERAGE CLASS SIZE= 11.50

NON-INSTRUCTION

CODE	# MIN	%AGE		
1	47	4.35	DIRECTIONS	49.62%
2	1	0.09	HOUSECLEANING	
3	125	11.57	TRANSITION	
4	7	0.65	CLASS CONTROL	
5	356	32.96	OTHER	

BASIC INSTRUCTION

CODE	# MIN	%AGE		
1	255	23.61	READING	50.0%
2	285	26.39	MATH	

OTHER INSTRUCTION

CODE	# MIN	%AGE		
3	1	0.09	RE.	.37%
5	1	0.09	Between Class	
6	2	0.19	Other	

Not staggered

Schedule: Primary 90 mins. Reading or Math
60 Comm. School/snack
90 mins Reading or Math

Intermediate 80 Reading or Math
20 Brk.
80 Reading or Math
60 Community School

not staggered
but 10 minutes
short on reading
and math at inter-
mediate level.

83.04

SCHOOL: [redacted]

WITHOUT THE FIRST DAY

OF OBSERVATIONS= 2
TOTAL # OF MINUTES= 360
AVERAGE CLASS SIZE= 10.50

NON-INSTRUCTION

CODE	# MIN	%AGE		
1	27	7.50	DIRECTIONS	45.28
3	28	7.78	HOUSECLEANING	
4	3	0.83	CLASSCONTROL	
5	105	29.17	OTHER	

BASIC INSTRUCTION

CODE	# MIN	%AGE		
1	87	24.17	READING	54.17
2	108	30.00	MATH	

OTHER INSTRUCTION

CODE	# MIN	%AGE		
3	2	0.56	PE	.56

Schedule

Gr 1 & 3 Not staggered
90 mins reading or math
45 mins recreation
15 mins snack
90 mins reading or math

Gr 2 & 4 One class staggered in 45 min. blocks
90 mins reading or math
45 mins reading or math
45 mins recreation
15 mins snack
45 mins reading or math

83.04

SCHOOL: [redacted]

WITHOUT THE FIRST DAY

OF OBSERVATIONS= 3
TOTAL # OF MINUTES= 540
AVERAGE CLASS SIZE= 10.33

NON-INSTRUCTION

CODE	# MIN	%AGE		
1	24	4.44	DIRECTIONS	49.44
3	59	10.93	TRANSITION	
4	4	0.74	CLASS CONTROL	
5	180	33.33	OTHER	

BASIC INSTRUCTION

CODE	# MIN	%AGE		
1	102	18.89	READING	47.96
2	157	29.07	MATH	

OTHER INSTRUCTION

CODE	# MIN	%AGE		
4	2	0.37	LUNCH	2.59
5	4	0.74	BETWEEN CLASS	
6	8	1.48	OTHER	

Not staggered for grades 1 & 2

Staggered for Grades 3-6

Gr 1 & 2

8:30-10:00 ~~Reading or Math~~
10:00-10:20 Snack
10:20-11:00 Community Education
11:00-12:30 Reading or Math

Grade 3-6

8:30-9:40 Reading or Math
9:40-10:20 Comm. School
10:20-10:40 Snack
10:40-11:00 Rest of 1st Class
11:00-12:30 Reading or Math

83.04

SCHOOL: [redacted] WITHOUT THE FIRST DAY

OF OBSERVATIONS= 3
TOTAL # OF MINUTES= 540
AVERAGE CLASS SIZE= 14.33

NON-INSTRUCTION

CODE	# MIN	%AGE		
1	13	2.41	DIRECTIONS	37.96%
3	99	18.33	TRANSITION	
4	4	0.74	CLASS CONTROL	
5	89	16.48	OTHER	

BASIC INSTRUCTION

CODE	# MIN	%AGE		
1	177	32.78	READING	62.04%
2	158	29.26	MATH	

OTHER INSTRUCTION

CODE	# MIN	%AGE
		NONE

Schedule: Staggered for reading or math. Students received 1 subject in 1½ hr. block; the other in 2 blocks: 1¼ hr. and ¼ hr. after recreation & snack time.

83.04

SCHOOL: [redacted]

WITHOUT THE FIRST DAY

OF OBSERVATIONS= 5
TOTAL # OF MINUTES= 900
AVERAGE CLASS SIZE= 9.40

NON-INSTRUCTION

CODE	# MIN	%AGE	
1	35	3.89	1= Directions
2	1	0.11	2= Housecleaning
3	72	8.00	3 = Transition
4	4	0.44	4 = Class Control
5	348	38.67	5= Other

51.11%

BASIC INSTRUCTION

CODE	# MIN	%AGE	
1	217	24.11	1 = Reading
2	216	24.00	2 = Math

48.11%

OTHER INSTRUCTION

CODE	# MIN	%AGE	
5	7	0.78	5 = Between Class

.78%

Schedule

½ of students had staggered schedules in longer blocks.

Group 1

60 minutes math
45 minutes recreation
45 math & snack/restroom
90 mins. reading

Group 2

90 minutes reading
45 mins. rec./snack/restroom
90 minutes math

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Ed Small, President

Manuel Navarro, Vice President

Nan Clayton, Secretary

Larry G. Waterhouse

Peter W. Werner, M. D.

Bernice Hart

Abel R. Ruiz

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Dr. John Ellis

ACTING DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Dr. Glynn Ligon